



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

469 C: τί δέ; σκυλεύειν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, τοὺς τελευτήσαντας πλὴν ὄπλων, ἐπειδὰν νικήσωσιν, ἦ καλῶς ἔχει;

Sophist. 248 E: τί δὲ πρὸς Διός; ὡς ἀληθῶς κίνησιν καὶ ζῶην καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ φρόνησιν ἦ ραδίως πεισθησόμεθα τῷ παντελῶς ὄντι μὴ παρῆναι;

I am inclined to accept Valckenaer's correction of ἦ for ἡ also in Euripides *Hecuba* 1013,

ποῦ δῆτα; πέπλων ἐντὸς ἡ κρύψας' ἔχεις;

though the parallels in this case do not apply with equal cogency.

W. A. HEIDEL

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

ON THE MEANING OF *BIDUUM* IN CERTAIN PHRASES

In *Classical Philology*, IX, 78 ff., Mr. Conrad questions the correctness of my "theory" that *post biduum* and *biduo post* may sometimes mean "on the following day." Although I examined a large number of such expressions and found very few in which the time could be determined with any degree of certainty, it is quite possible that a detailed study of all the phrases of the kind which occur in Latin literature might throw some light on the question; but the reason given for excluding *biennium*, *triennium*, and the like, does not seem to me valid.

I hardly need to be informed at my time of life that the biographies of the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* are a piece of patchwork; yet even so, one might suppose that the *disiecta membra* were put together with some slight regard for logic and common-sense. However, a single instance of the usage in so careful a writer as Caesar is enough to support my "theory," about which I am quite open-minded.

It is not easy to understand Mr. Conrad's notion of an "unfair" and "arbitrary" assumption. If I were to use those epithets, I should be inclined to apply them to the assumption of Napoleon and Stoffel, made without evidence or argument and in spite of Caesar's silence, that the Germans attacked the Romans a second time the day after the conference between Caesar and Ariovistus; or to the even less probable assumption of Mr. Conrad that "the first assault was followed on the next day by a series of skirmishes." Caesar makes no reference to these alleged skirmishes, and the only possible argument for their occurrence is to assume that *biduo post* always means "two days later," which is the very question at issue. We may grant that Caesar is terse and wastes no words, but he could surely have found room for a single line to mention an event of such importance, or at least for the single word *iterum*, if his language in i. 47. 2 can be conceived of as referring to an attack on the Roman camp or to a day of skirmishing. My assumption that no such attack took place was supported by a number

of arguments, which still seem to me good ones, as well as by Caesar's silence, and was therefore neither "unfair" nor "arbitrary," if I understand the meaning of those terms.

But since one man's assumption is as good as another's, I am willing to waive all the arguments based upon mere probability, and to confine myself to those derived from Caesar's own language. In his second reference to an attack by the Germans, Caesar uses the very same words which he had used in his first reference: cf. i. 46. 1, "*Caesari nuntiatum est equites Ariovisti . . . ad nostros adequitare, lapides telaque in nostros conicere*," and i. 47. 2, "*conloquendi Caesari causa visa non est, et eo magis quod pridie eius diei Germani retineri non potuerant quin in nostros tela conicerent*." This can hardly be accidental, and it still seems to me "significant, if not in itself convincing."

There are further arguments to be derived from Caesar's words. In the first place, if the Germans made an attack on Caesar's camp between the time of the conference with Ariovistus and Caesar's refusal to consent to another parley, Caesar could hardly have described such an attack by the words "*Germani in nostros tela coniecerunt*" or "*Germani venerunt ut in nostros tela conicerent*"; cf. i. 50. 2, "*tum demum Ariovistus partem suarum copiarum, quae castra minora oppugnaret misit*," where perhaps *tum demum* is not without significance. That so careful a writer should have described a day of skirmishing in such terms is even less probable.

In the second place, what does he mean by saying "*Germani retineri non potuerant quin in nostros tela conicerent*"? An attack on the Romans after the truce would have been perfectly legitimate and proper, had the Germans thought best to make one. Who then, or what, would be expected to try to prevent them from making it? Shall we add to one arbitrary assumption a second, that the Germans made the attack, or engaged in a day's skirmishing, in spite of the efforts of Ariovistus to prevent them? Surely Caesar would not sacrifice clearness to terseness to that extent, and add to the reader's confusion by referring to the second attack in the very same words which he had used of a different one, words too which are appropriate to the attack during the conference, but quite inappropriate to the alleged second attack or to a day of skirmishing.

If, however, we understand the second reference to be to the attack made during the truce, the language is both plain and significant. He uses the same words in the two references to the attack, both to make it clear to the attentive reader that his second reference *was* to the same attack, and because it is a correct description of that particular attack. The Germans could not be kept from assaulting the Romans by any regard for the *ius gentium*, in accordance with which such an action during an armistice was treacherous and unlawful; or possibly by Ariovistus, who may conceivably have been more scrupulous, although the context certainly implies premeditated bad faith on his part.

There is one more guidepost for the thoughtful reader in this significant sentence. The clause "quod . . . conicerent" gives Caesar's reason for declining a second parley: "*conloquendi causa visa non est, et eo magis quod . . . conicerent.*" Now an attack on the Romans when there was no conference, or a day's skirmishing under the same conditions, would give Caesar no excuse for not consenting to meet Ariovistus a second time; the fact that the Germans could not be kept from attacking the Romans *during a truce* was an excellent reason for such an attitude.

Unless *biduo post* means "on the following day," my faith in Caesar's ability to express himself clearly is greatly shaken. If the words do have that meaning, my "theory" requires no additional support.¹

JOHN C. ROLFE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

ON SUETONIUS *De grammaticis* 5

A hexameter couplet of Saevius Nicanor's, preserved in Suetonius' *De grammaticis* 5, still offers an interesting puzzle for the student of hermeneutics. The most recent editors of the fragments of Suetonius, Roth (*Suetonius de grammat. et rhetor.*, Leipzig, 1858) and Reifferscheid (*C. Suetoni Tranquilli praeter Caesarum libros reliquiae*, Leipzig, 1860) print the distich under consideration, and that part of the context necessary for its elucidation, as follows:

Saevius Nicanor . . . fecit . . . saturam quoque, in qua libertinum se ac duplici cognomine esse per haec indicat:

Saevius Nicanor Marci libertus negabit:

Saevius† post huius* idem ac Marcus docebit.

The † is Reifferscheid's (see p. 104); the *, Roth's (see p. 259). The latter also has *Sevius*.

The main difficulty of course is in the last line and appears in the various codices as follows (see Roth, p. lxxviii; Reiff., p. 104):

V²—post huius idem ac†^{at}

L—post huius idem ac

O—posthus idem ac

G—post hoc idem at
 $\begin{matrix} & s \\ & \vdots \\ & \wedge \end{matrix}$

¹ A recent edition of Caesar has on *biduo post*: "The statement conflicts with *pridie*. But a further engagement may have occurred in the meantime." My contention is that Caesar's language, for the reasons given above, *absolutely precludes* such a supposition. It is a great satisfaction to have had my interpretation accepted by such an authority on Caesar as Dr. T. Rice Holmes, in his edition of the *Gallie War*, published by the Clarendon Press in February, 1914.

² For an explanation of the sigla, see Reiff., pp. 98–99. A concise discussion of the value of the corresponding MSS may be found in Roth, pp. lvii–lix.